



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of the Empire through the early Christian centuries, and ascribes the failure of Christianity at first to elevate her condition to the fanatical asceticism of the more narrow-minded Christian fathers.

In all this there is little to praise or censure. The original sources have been consulted, but are not cited with sufficient fullness or precision to make the book a valuable work of reference. Sophocles does not represent one of his characters as regretting the loss of a brother or sister much more than that of a wife (p. 33). On the contrary, it is a woman, Antigone, who says that she could more easily replace a husband than a brother. In his account of the supposed speeches of Cato and L. Valerius in the Oppian Law Dr. Donaldson hardly appreciates the delicious humor of Livy. In citing Horace's *Nullis polluitur casta domus stupris* as proof of the success of the *Lex Julia* he takes an optimistic view of the evidential value of court poetry. It is not quite certain that Erinna was a pupil of Sappho; nor is it more than a conjecture that her poem, the "Distaff", sings the first revolt of the college girl against household drudgery.

But these are trifles. Dr. Donaldson's readable little book is perhaps quite as useful as a work of more solid erudition would be. Woman is half the world, as Plato said, and cannot be profitably studied, as some think she cannot study, in falsifying isolation from man. It is possible to tabulate for reference the laws and customs which from age to age have regulated the status of daughter, wife, widow or *hetaira*. But what generally passes for the study of woman is simply the study of sex—an essentially unhistorical theme for *plus ça change plus c'est la même chose*.

PAUL SHOREY.

Genséric, la Conquête Vandale en Afrique et la Destruction de l'Empire d'Occident. Par F. MARTROYE. (Paris: Hachette et Cie. 1907. Pp. vii, 392.)

THIS work is based on a careful use of all the available sources and presents a satisfactory account of the Vandal kingdom to the death of Genseric, 477.

The introduction is devoted mainly to a narrative of the Donatist controversy, the recital of which is used by M. Martroye to portray the separatist tendencies in Africa and the wretched condition of the African provinces. Chapter I. (La Conquête, pp. 78-136) covers the period from the death of Honorius, 423, to the treaty of 442 between Theodosius and Genseric. The events narrated are the rivalry of Aëtius and Boniface, the earlier wanderings of the Vandals, the career of the Visigoths under Ataulph and Wallia, and the conquest of Africa, 429-442. Some of M. Martroye's conclusions should be noticed: he is inclined to accept the story of the treason of Boniface and its motives as given by Procopius; he reckons the effective force of the Vandal army as 50,000 men at the most; the portion of Africa promised to

Genseric by Boniface he supposes to have been Mauretania, and that assigned the Vandals by the treaty of 442, proconsular Africa, Byzacene, and part of Numidia.

Chapter II. (*Politique et Alliances de Genséric*, pp. 137-165) continues the history to the sack of Rome, 455, and deals with the career of Attila, the palace intrigues in the time of Valentinian III., and the sack of Rome by the Vandals. Chapter III. (*La Guerre contre l'Empire*, pp. 166-262) is devoted mainly to an account of conditions in the West during the domination of Recimer, Orestes, and Odoacer in Italy. The relation of the Vandal kingdom to these events, of course, is given special attention. It is in this connection that M. Martroye develops his theory of the policy of Genseric; he shows him forming alliances with the Visigoths, Suevi, and Ostrogoths, intriguing with revolting generals of the East and the West, and taking part in the court politics of Rome and Constantinople. "The clever diplomacy of Genseric had succeeded in bringing about a situation analogous to that which, thirty years later, made the strength of Theodoric the Great. By his efforts an entente was established among the barbarians, and he became the bond of union among them and in a way their chief" (p. 235).

The material for chapter IV. (*L'Organisation de la Conquête*, pp. 263-325) is very meagre, but M. Martroye is able to show that the Roman administration was taken over almost complete by the Vandal kings. The Vandals were settled entirely in proconsular Africa, on lands taken from the former proprietors. They had a military organization, copied, M. Martroye asserts, from the Roman army; but there is nothing to indicate the persistence of any tribal organization. The Vandals were judged by Vandal law, but about the nature of this law or the method of administering it there seems to be no information.

Chapter V. (*Le Gouvernement de Genséric*, pp. 326-381) is devoted mainly to a discussion of the persecution of the Catholics and Roman aristocracy in proconsular Africa. In both cases the rigor of Genseric was inspired by political motives. In general the Vandal occupation, says M. Martroye, was not so disastrous as one might suppose; the provinces were spared the continual invasions that were devastating western Europe, the Moors were kept quiet by fear of the Vandals and the civil disturbances of the earlier period are not heard of after the conquest. Trade and commerce even began to revive after the wars of Genseric.

M. Martroye's estimate of Genseric is interesting. "He was the initiator of the system which some years later Theodoric put into practice in Italy." "Endowed to an extraordinary degree with the cunning (*l'esprit de ruse*) which a life of adventures had developed among the barbarians, and which their contemporaries regarded as their distinguishing characteristic, he possessed a rare ability for diplomatic intrigues." He was not, however, a statesman, and was not able to create a government that would endure.

M. Martroye's use of the sources is in general convincing, although his conclusions in some cases will be questioned. In the matter of the conscious policy which he attributes to Genseric the reader will feel that his theory, plausible and likely as it may be, is not completely established. He gives perhaps too much space to the miracles and marvels related by religious writers and to what in one instance he terms the "récits romanesques" of such chroniclers as Procopius and Jordanes, but these serve to enliven the narrative and do not seriously detract from its sober quality.

E. H. MCNEAL.

BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Dramatic Traditions of the Dark Ages. By JOSEPH S. TUNISON. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1907. Pp. xviii, 350.)

THE object of this book is to show that the Greek theatre existed in the Byzantine Empire throughout the Middle Ages and influenced the development in western Europe of both the medieval and the modern drama. As evidence the author cites literary productions, notices of persons and things theatrical, and practices in church and in social life. To connect the medieval and the modern drama with the unbroken Greek tradition, he tries to show that, when the medieval drama originated and when it was transformed into the modern, influence from Greece was actually present as a shaping force.

The book is very irritating, but very interesting and useful. It is interesting and useful, because it calls attention to many forgotten or only half-regarded features of Byzantine civilization in literature, in social life, and in the church. It is irritating, because the reader too often feels that, in order to reach sound conclusions, he must himself repeat Mr. Tunison's investigations. Dates are rarely given, though in such a discussion they are often essential; statements of fact fundamental to the discussion are often made without presentation of the evidence; the author too often uses evidence that has been discredited by recent research and too often makes unjustifiable inferences. The space allotted for this review permits only a few of the most flagrant examples.

On page eighty Eudocia (393-460) is cited as authority for comedy and the comedian Dexippus. In all the extant writings by this Eudocia (ed. Ludwich, Teubner texts), there is nothing of this nature. Apparently she is confused with another Eudocia (eleventh century), the putative author of the *Violarium*, a biographical dictionary now known to have been compiled about 1543. In the standard text of this (J. Flach, Teubner texts), section 309 is devoted to the comic writer Dioxippus (the older texts have Dexippus), and four of his comedies are mentioned.

Perhaps the most remarkable instances of uncritical procedure are connected with the attempt to ascribe the beginnings of the medieval